

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Fienberg-Fisher K8 Center	District Name: Miami-Dade
Principal: Maria G. Zabala	Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho
SAC Chair: Mrs. Maria Cruz	Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

[School Grades Trend Data](#) (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

[Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test \(FCAT\)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data](#) (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

[High School Feedback Report](#)

[K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan](#)

Administrators

List your school's administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)					
Principal	Maria G. Zabala	B.A. – B.A.- Psychology, Florida International University, Master’s Degree- Nova Southeastern University- Educational Leadership Certifications: Specific Learning Disabilities K-12; ESOL Endorsement K-12; Ed Leadership K-12	12	12		’12	’11	’10	’09	’08
					School Grade	B	A	A	A	A
					AYP	N/A	N	N	N	N
					High Standards Rdg.	50	63	64	71	73
					High Standards Math	48	69	67	69	70
					Lrng Gains-Rdg.	68	60	67	64	68
					Lrng Gains-Math	67	70	66	67	69
					Gains-Rdg-25%	67	56	67	66	63
					Gains-Math-25%	72	78	69	70	72
					Algebra I	74				
Assistant Principal	Aisha V. Marrero	B.S. Varying Exceptionalities K-12, Nova Southeastern University; M.S. Reading K-12; Nova Southeastern University; Ed.S Educational Leadership Nova Southeastern University Certifications: Varying Exceptionalities K-12, Reading K-12, Educational Leadership K-12,ESOL Endorsed	4	6		’12	’11	’10	’09	’08
					School Grade	B	A	A	A	Adult
					AYP	N/A	N	N	N	
					High Standards Rdg.	50	63	64	71	
					High Standards Math	48	69	67	69	
					Lrng Gains-Rdg.	68	60	67	64	
					Lrng Gains-Math	67	70	66	67	
					Gains-Rdg-25%	67	56	67	66	
					Gains-Math-25%	72	78	69	70	
					Algebra I	74				
Assistant Principal	Mary V. Murphy	B.S.- Elementary Education, University of Miami; Master of Education – Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern University Certifications: Elem. Ed. K-6th grade, Educational Leadership K-12, ESOL Endorsed	6	11		12	’11	’10	’09	’08
					School Grade	B	A	A	A	A
					AYP	N/A	N	N	N	N
					High Standards Rdg.	50	63	64	71	73
					High Standards Math	48	69	67	69	70
					Lrng Gains-Rdg.	68	60	67	64	68
					Lrng Gains-Math	67	70	66	67	69
					Gains-Rdg-25%	67	56	67	66	63
					Gains-Math-25%	72	78	69	70	72
					Algebra I	74				

Instructional Coaches

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)					
Reading Coach	Danielle Klahr	Professional Educator's: Varying Exceptionalities K-12, Reading K-12, ESOL K-12	11	5		'12	'11	'10	'09	'08
					School Grade	B	A	A	A	A
					AYP	N/A	N	N	N	N
					High Standards Rdg.	50	63	64	71	73
					High Standards Math	48	69	67	69	70
					Lrng Gains-Rdg.	68	60	67	64	68
					Lrng Gains-Math	67	70	66	67	69
					Gains-Rdg-25%	67	56	67	66	63
					Gains-Math-25%	72	78	69	70	72
					Algebra I	74				

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Regular scheduled meetings attended by New Teachers, Administration, and Coaching staff.	Principal, Asst. Principal, and Reading Coaches	On-going
2. Recruiting interns from Education programs from local universities.	Principal	On-going
3. Faculty and Staff Appreciation Activities during meetings	Principal	Ongoing

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

4. Teacher attendance support and incentives	Principal	Ongoing
--	-----------	---------

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
3	Teachers are encouraged to attend M-DCPS provided professional development to achieve the necessary endorsements for certification.

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
66	0 (0.00%)	20 (30.30%)	25 (37.88%)	21 (31.82%)	32 (48.48%)	42 (87.5%)	5 (7.58%)	2 (3.03%)	49 (74.24%)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
N/A			

--	--	--	--

DRAFT

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A: Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after-school programs or summer school. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Support services are provided to secondary students. Curriculum Coaches develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk;” assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Other components that are integrated into the school-wide program include an extensive Parental Involvement Program; Title I CHESS; Supplemental Educational Services; and special support services to special needs populations such as homeless, migrant, and neglected and delinquent students.

Title I, Part C- Migrant: The school provides services and support to migrant students and parents. The District Migrant Liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs and conducts a comprehensive needs assessment of migrant students to ensure that the unique needs of migrant students are met.

Title I, Part D: District receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach Program. Services are coordinated with district Dropout Prevention Programs.

Title II: The District uses supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows:

- training to certify qualified mentors for the New Teacher (MINT) Program.
- training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ESOL
- training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaison (PDL) at each school focusing on Professional Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocols

Title III: Title III funds are used to supplement and enhance the programs for ELL and immigrant students by providing these services: Parent Outreach Activities and behavioral/mental counseling services.

Title X- Homeless: Safe and Drug Free Schools: District receives funds for programs (Red Ribbon Week, Mentors at Middle Schools, etc.) that support prevention of violence in and around the school. These programs prevent the use of alcohol, tobacco, drugs and foster a safe, drug free learning environment supporting student achievement.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI): Fienberg-Fisher will receive funding from Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) as part of its Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) allocation.

Violence Prevention Programs: The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that incorporate field trips, community service, drug tests, and counseling.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Nutrition Programs:

- 1) The school adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District Wellness Policy.
- 2) Nutrition education as per state statute is taught through physical education.
- 3) The School Fund Service Program, school breakfast, school lunch, and after care snacks, follows the Healthy Food and Beverage Guidelines as adopted in the District Wellness Policy. Our school is also for part of the Alliance for a Healthier Generation initiative which impacts the physical, wellness of students and staff. The school encourages students and staff to make healthier lifestyle choices by providing healthier food choices in the cafeteria and staff lounge. We also provide after school physical fitness classes for students and staff.
- 4) The school has been awarded Bronze Level in the Health Schools rating program

Housing Programs: N/A

Head Start: The Head Start Program is now part of our school community. Activities, including professional development and transition processes are now lead by Fienberg-Fisher K8 Center. Parent classes in support for Kindergarten preparation are offered by the Community Liaison and IB PYP Coordinator. The Summer VPK program will be provided at the school's Head Start sites.

Adult Education: N/A

Career and Technical Education: N/A

Job Training: N/A

Other: Parental Involvement Program Description

Involve parents in the planning and implementation of the Title I program and extend an open invitation to our school's parent resource center in order to inform parents regarding available program's their rights under No Child Left Behind and other referral services.

Increase parental engagement/involvement through developing (with on-going parental input) our Title I School-Parent Compact (for each student); and other documents/activities necessary in order to comply with dissemination and reporting requirements.

Conduct informal parent surveys to determine specific needs of our parents, and survey workshops, Parents Academy Courses, etc., with flexible times to accommodate our parent's schedule as part of our goal to empower parents and build their capacity for involvement.

Complete Title I Administration Parental Involvement Monthly School Reports.

Confidential "as-needed services" will be provided to any students in the school in "homeless situations" as applicable.

Additional academic and support services will be provided to students and families of the Migrant population as applicable.

School Improve Grant Fund/ School Improvement Grant Initiative

The school receives funding under the School Improvement Grant Fund/School Improvement Grant Initiative in order to increase the achievement of the lowest performing subgroups through comprehensive, ongoing data analysis, curriculum and instruction alignment, and specific interventions such as extended day remedial tutorial instruction,

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Differentiated Instruction/intervention, classroom libraries, Project CRISS and Learning 100. Additionally, Title I School Improvement Grant/Fund support funding and assistance to schools in Differentiated Accountability based on need.

The Voluntary Public School Choice Program (I Choose!) a federally funded grant, is a district wide initiative designed to assist in achieving the Miami-Dade Public School's District's Strategic Plan goal to expand the availability of and access to high quality public school choice options for all parents in Miami-Dade County. Voluntary Public School grant funds are used to evaluate programs, inform parents of educational options, and re-culture teaching practices to establish quality school environments.

DRAFT

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) /Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS/RtI Leadership Team.</p> <p>1. Team Members – We have considered the following individuals for the school’s MTSS/RtI Team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Administrators- who will insure commitment and allocate resources• Teachers and Coaches who share the common goal of improving instruction• Team members who will work to build staff support, internal capacity, and sustainability over time. <p>2. The school’s Leadership Team will include additional personnel as resources to the team, based on specific problems or concerns, such as :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• School math, science and behavioral specialists• Special Education personnel• School guidance counselor• School psychologist• School social worker• Member of Advisory group• Community Stakeholder
<p>Describe how the school-based MTSS/RtI Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS/RtI efforts?</p> <p>MTSS/RtI is a general education initiative in which levels of support (resources) are allocated in direct proportion to student needs. The MTSS/RtI levels of interventions are usually thought of as tiers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The first level of support is the core instructional and behavioral methodologies, practices, and supports designed for all students in the general curriculum.• The second level of support consists of supplemental instruction and interventions that are provided in addition to and in alignment with the effective core instruction and behavioral supports to groups of targeted students who need additional instruction and/or behavioral support.• The third level of support consists of intensive instructional and or behavioral interventions that are provided in addition to and in alignment with the effective core instruction and the supplemental instruction and interventions with the goal of increasing an individual’s student’s rate of progress academically and/or behaviorally. There will be an ongoing evaluation method established for services at each tier to monitor the effectiveness of meeting school goals and student growth as measured by benchmark and progress monitoring data.
<p>Describe the role of the school-based MTSS/RtI Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the MTSS/RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?</p> <p>1. The Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the school’s academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis.</p> <p>2. The Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention.</p> <p>3. The Leadership Team will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.</p>

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

MTSS/RtI Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

1. Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to:

- Adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students
- Adjust the delivery of behavior management system
- Adjust the allocation of school based resources
- Drive decisions regarding targeted professional development
- Create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions

2. Managed Data will include:

Academic

- FAIR assessment
- Interim assessments
- State/Local Math and Science assessments
- FCAT 2.0
- Student grades
- School site specific assessments

Behavior

- Student Case Management System
- Detentions
- Suspensions/Expulsions
- Referrals by student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative context
- Office referrals per day per month
- Team climate surveys
- Attendance
- Referrals to special education programs

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS/RtI.

The district professional development and support will include:

1. training for all administrators in the MTSS/RtI problem solving, data analysis process;
2. providing support for school staff to understand basic MTSS/RtI principles and procedures; and
3. providing a network of ongoing support for MTSS/RtI organized through feeder patterns.

Describe plan to support MTSS/RtI.

MTSS/RtI is a general education initiative in which levels of support (resources) are allocated in direct proportion to student needs. The MTSS/RtI levels of interventions are usually thought of as tiers.

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

- The first level of support is the core instructional and behavioral methodologies, practices, and supports designed for all students in the general curriculum.
- The second level of support consists of supplemental instruction and interventions that are provided in addition to and in alignment with the effective core instruction and behavioral supports to groups of targeted students who need additional instruction and/or behavioral support.
- The third level of support consists of intensive instructional and or behavioral interventions that are provided in addition to and in alignment with the effective core instruction and the supplemental instruction and interventions with the goal of increasing individual student's rate of progress academically and/or behaviorally. There will be an ongoing evaluation method established for services at each tier to monitor the effectiveness of meeting school goals and student growth as measured by benchmark and progress monitoring data.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

The Literacy Leadership Team is also an extension of the school's Leadership Team, supported by administration to create capacity of reading knowledge within the school building with a focus on areas of literacy concern across the school. These team members work to build a learning community that includes all stakeholders, motivating students to become life-long readers.

A Literacy Leadership Team is a collaborative system that encourages a literate climate to support effective teaching and learning.

1. Team Members – We have considered the following individuals for the Literacy Leadership Team

- Administrators- who will insure commitment and allocate resources
- Teachers and Coaches who share the common goal of improving literacy instruction
- Team members who will work to build staff support, internal capacity, and sustainability over time.

2. The school's Literacy Leadership Team will include additional personnel as resources to the team, based on specific problems or concerns, such as :

- School Reading Coaches: Daniel Klahr;
- Special Education Personnel: Ingrid Whalen
- School Guidance Counselor: Fredeswinda Torres; Sandra Murphy
- School Psychologist: Elizabeth Monestime
- School Social Worker: Jessie Stebenne
- Member of Advisory Group: Pierrela Jeanbaptiste, EESAC
- Community Stakeholder: Maria Cruz, Kiwanis Club

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

Actions to Support the Staff

- Conducting daily Read Alouds in all content area classes
- Conducting monthly mini-workshops during Early Release Days
- Forming study groups
- Researching strategies to address the concern
- Providing materials, resources, assistance to address the concerns and needs of the students
- Attending workshops/conferences on topic
- Modeling lessons in classrooms
- Provide ongoing coaching and support in the classrooms
- Analyzing and reviewing data
- Sharing and reporting through data chats
- Conducting Literacy conferences after each reading assessment

Revising the concern based on the data

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

- Build a learning community of committed, school-based professionals

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

- Study scientifically based reading research
- Develop a school-based literacy plan of action
- Supply research-based professional development

Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the “Upload” page.

DRAFT

****Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition***

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

Title I Administration assists the school by providing supplemental funds beyond the State of Florida funded Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten (VPK). Funds are used to provide extended support through a full time highly qualified teacher and paraprofessional. This will assist with providing young children with a variety of meaningful learning experiences, in environments that give them opportunities to create knowledge through initiatives shared with supportive adults. Fienberg-Fisher K-8 houses a day care center, the Rain (Referral and Information Network) Drop Center, where parents can leave their children aged 0 to 3 years while they go to work. The school is also a home to the Head Start Program for 3 year old children. The National Head Start Association is a private not-for-profit membership organization dedicated exclusively to meeting the needs of Head Start children and their families. The Head Start Program helps children and their family's transition from preschool to elementary school. The Pre-Kindergarten students at Fienberg-Fisher K-8 Center are enrolled in the Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten (VPK) Program funded by the state and supplemented by Title I funds for an all-day program. In an effort to accommodate the transition of these students to Kindergarten, Fienberg-Fisher K-8 Center has established several practices. Initially, the students in the Pre-Kindergarten Program are taught and provided with the skills needed to properly interact and adjust to the Kindergarten Program through the use of the High Scope Curriculum. As part of this curriculum, students learn to interact with one another, work in small group and large group situations and they learn to make choices within the constructs of a classroom setting. Additionally, the teachers use the BELL Curriculum to teach phonological awareness and language skills. The staff responsible for implementing these strategies is made up of the Pre-Kindergarten teachers, the paraprofessionals and the School Support Team. In order to ensure appropriate readiness for the Kindergarten classroom, grade level articulation meetings are held monthly. The Pre-Kindergarten teachers become familiar with the Kindergarten Grade Level Expectations and prepare the students accordingly. The parents of the Pre-Kindergarten students meet with the teachers quarterly to review the students' progress using the Child Observation Record Form and the Key Notes. The teachers take specific notes daily and when they meet with the parents, they offer feedback on student progress. To compile quantitative data on the student's readiness for Kindergarten, the Pre-Kindergarten teachers administer several assessments throughout the year. Using the Devereux Early Childhood Assessment (DECA), teachers are able to assess social/emotional behaviors that may be of concern before the student progresses to Kindergarten. Using the Learning Accomplishment Profile – Diagnostic (LAP-D) pre and post assessment, teachers assess the cognitive, language, fine motor and gross motor development of each student. At the end of the school year, the Pre-Kindergarten students visit the Kindergarten classes to help them with transition. Additionally, the Pre-Kindergarten parents are given an opportunity to visit the Kindergarten classes to give them an understanding of the upcoming expectations.

****Grades 6-12 Only*** Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S

For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

Fienberg-Fisher K- 8 Center utilizes a variety of instructional teaching models. We are an International Baccalaureate (IB) World School, housing a Middle Years Programme (MYP) and we are in candidacy for the Primary Years Programme (PYP). The IB programs will continue to be implemented for the 2011-2012 school year in kindergarten through 8th grades. Specifically teachers in the MYP, grades 6th through 8th, will use the IB philosophy where students study the core subjects through the five areas of interaction: approaches to learning, community and service, human ingenuity, environment, and health and social education. The IB philosophy makes it necessary that teachers in all subject groups include interdisciplinary planning horizontally and vertically throughout the school year, thereby incorporating reading across the curriculum. Opportunities for the teachers to plan by grade level and subject area have been incorporated into the planning schedule for the 2011-2012 school year. Through this innovative teaching style, teachers provide students with the tools to enable them to take responsibility for their own learning, further developing an awareness of how they learn best, of thought processes and of learning strategies. Additionally, through the community service component students will be required to take an active part in the communities in which they live, thereby encouraging responsible citizenship. Sixth through eighth teachers will also utilize a variety of technological instructional materials for remediation such as Smart Boards and web-based programs. A variety of instructional materials for all subjects and all grade levels are utilized throughout the school day to provide students with differentiated instruction, as well as, individual learning modalities. Field trips will provide an opportunity for students to incorporate what they have learned in the classroom to connect to real life experiences.

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

****High Schools Only***

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

N/A

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#).

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1a.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test many grade level content cluster scores remained stagnant and/or dropped. This occurred in the area of Gr 3and 8 Reading Application, Gr 4,5, 8 Literary Analysis, Gr 4 Informational Text/Research Process, and Gr 7 Vocabulary	1a.1. Implement grade level data chats in order to guide reading instruction which promotes the use of context clues, the use of concept maps, word meanings, phrases, and expressions, relevant story details, and instruction in the ability to synthesize, analyze, and evaluate information.	1a.1. Literacy Leadership Team and Grade Level Chairs	1a.1. Scheduled quarterly reviews of Interim Assessment Data focused on students’ knowledge in the areas of Reading Application, Literary Analysis, Informational Text/Research Process, and Vocabulary	1a.1. Formative: District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
Reading Goal #1a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicates that 26% (142) of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 29% (157).	26% (142)	29% (157)					
			1a.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test many grade level content cluster scores remained stagnant and/or dropped. This occurred in the area of Gr 3and 8 Reading Application, Gr 4,5, 8 Literary Analysis, Gr 4 Informational Text/Research Process, and Gr 7 Vocabulary	1a.2. Infuse Successmaker, SOLO Program, Reading Plus, and Compass Learning internet based differentiated instructional tools. To support traditional instruction in the area of prefix & suffix, base words, root words, antonyms, synonyms, and multiple meaning words.	1a.2. Literacy Leadership Team and Grade Level Chairs	1a.2. Program Data review and evaluation. Focusing on student performance in the area of Reading Application, Literary Analysis, Informational Text/Research Process, and Vocabulary	1a.2. Formative: Pearson Education generated quarterly School Progress Report Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
			1a.3. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test many grade level content cluster scores remained stagnant and/or dropped. This occurred in the area of Gr 3and 8 Reading Application, Gr 4,5, 8 Literary	1a.3. Develop an instructional focus calendar infusing reading benchmarks across the curriculum in the area of Conclusions and Inferences, Cause and Effect, and the ability to locate, interpret, and organize information.	1a.3. Literacy Leadership Team and Grade Level Chairs	1a.3. Lesson plan reviews during classroom walkthroughs and teacher observations.	1a.3. Formative: District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			Analysis, Gr 4 Informational Text/Research Process, and Gr 7 Vocabulary				
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1b.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Reading Test 32% of the students did not meet the target standards in reading and 23% met standards and would benefit from maintenance of these Reading skills	1b.1. Shaping Behavior Approach will be used to support successful approximation teaching and retention of academic skills. Through reinforcement of positive behavioral results with the PMH group	1b.1. Literacy Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	1b.1. SPED department data Chats	1b.1. Formative: Teacher created individual assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
Reading Goal #1b:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>The results of the 2012 FAA Reading Test indicates that 23%(5) of students achieved Level 4, 5, and 6 proficiency. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase Level 4, 5, and 6 student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 28% (6)</i>	23% (5)	28% (6)					
			1b.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Reading Test 32% of the students did not meet the target standards in reading and 23% met standards and would benefit from maintenance of these Reading skills	1b.2. Implement the Unique Learning System curriculum through thematic units to support reading instruction at the students individual reading levels for the TMH group.	1b.2. Literacy Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	1b.2. Unique Learning Systems quarterly Unit Assessment Reports through SPED department data Chats	1b.2. Formative: Unique Learning Systems quarterly Unit Assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
			1b.3. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Reading Test 32% of the students did not meet the target standards in reading and 23% met standards and would benefit from maintenance of these Reading skills	1b.3. Implement the Mangomon curriculum for vocational and occupational learning	1b.3. Literacy Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	1b.3. Mangomon Evaluation Reports	1b.3. Formative: Teacher created assessments. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading.			2a.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 achievement in FCAT 2.0 Levels 4 and 5 remained the same at 23%. Reading Test areas which showed decline or minimal growth in grades 3 through 5 were Gr 3 Reading Application, Gr 4,5, Literary Analysis, Gr 4 Informational Text/Research Process	2a.1. Implement the six transdisciplinary themes of the IB PYP Programme which enrich and support reading instruction in the area of Main Idea, Relevant Detail, Conclusion and Inferences.	2a.1. Literacy Leadership Team , IB PYP Lead Teacher	2a.1. Grade level instructional Unit Plans Assessment tool.	2a.1. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
Reading Goal #2a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicates that 23% (124) of students achieved Level 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal</i>	23% (124)	24% (130)					

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

for the 2013 school year is to increase level 4 and 5 student proficiency by 1 percentage points to 24% (130).			2a.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 achievement in FCAT 2.0 Levels 4 and 5 remained the same at 23%. Reading Test areas which showed decline or minimal growth in grades 6 through 8 were Gr 8 Reading Application, Gr 8 Literary Analysis, and Gr 7 Vocabulary	2a.2. Implement enriched reading instruction through the use of the five Areas of Interaction of the IB MYP Programme which will include word relationships, multiple meanings, and analyzing text.	2a.2. Literacy Leadership Team , IB MYP Lead Teacher	2a.2. 2 Cross-curricular Unit Plan Assessment Criterion.	2a.2. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7, 8, and 9 in reading.			2b.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Reading Test 45% of the students met high standards in reading and 23% met standards and would benefit from maintenance of these Reading skills	2b.1. Use teacher created cue and correction procedures, reinforces and reinforcement schedules, natural cue and correction conditions, and natural reinforcement conditions for the PMH program.	2b.1. Literacy Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	2b.1. SPED department data Chats	2b.1. Formative: Teacher created assessments. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment	
Reading Goal #2b: The results of the 2012 FAA Reading Test indicates that 45% (10) of students achieved at or above Level 7 proficiency. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase at or above Level 7 student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 48% (11)		2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		45% (10)	48% (11)	2b.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Reading Test 45% of the students met high standards in reading and 23% met standards and would benefit from maintenance of these Reading skills	2b.2. Provide tools for students at their cognitive ability to extend learning opportunities	2b.2. Literacy Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	2b.2. Unique Learning Systems quarterly Unit Assessments through SPED department data Chats	2b.2. Formative: Unique Learning Systems quarterly Unit Assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
				2b.3 As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Reading Test 45% of the students met high standards in reading and 23% met standards and would benefit from maintenance of these Reading skills	2b.3 Use of ecological inventory to strategies to develop functional skill sequences in career and occupational development for the EMH program.	2b.3 Literacy Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	2b.3 Mangomon career and occupational development inventory assessments	2b.3 Formative: Teacher created assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.			3a.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT	3a.1. Provide before and after school tutoring for targeted students in	3a.1. Literacy Leadership Team	3a.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim	3a.1. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Reading Goal #3a: <i>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicates that 67% (285) of students made Learning Gains. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase students making Learning Gains by 5 percentage points to 72% (306)</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	2.0 Reading Test the percent of students making Learning Gains 67% (285) as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading test 60% (259). Due to the 7 percentage point increase the plan is to continue the strategy in an attempt to duplicate the positive outcome.	the Reading subject area.		Assessment through comparative Data chats following the Fall and Winter Interim assessments	Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
	67% (285)	72% (306)					
			3a.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test the percent of students making Learning Gains 67% (285) as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading test 60% (259). Due to the 7 percentage point increase the plan is to continue the strategy in an attempt to duplicate the positive outcome.	3a.2. Include higher order thinking questions in lesson plans to improve critical thinking skills and reading comprehension.	3a.2. Literacy Leadership Team	3a.2. Lesson plan reviews during classroom walkthroughs and teacher observations.	3a.2. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
			3a.3. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test the percent of students making Learning Gains 67% (285) as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading test 60% (259). Due to the 7 percentage point increase the plan is to continue the strategy in an attempt to duplicate the positive outcome.	3a.3. Determine core instructional needs by reviewing FAIR (Florida Assessments in Reading) assessment data for all Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL, and SWD students. Plan differentiated instruction using Voyager.	3a.3. Literacy Leadership Team	3a.3. Student progress is assessed using FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.	3a.3. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.			3b.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Reading Test 20% of the students did not make Learning Gains in reading	3b.1. Respond to student needs as noted in assessment reports with Differentiated Instruction and additional instruction during Special Area courses	3b.1. Literacy Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	3b.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment through comparative Data chats following the Fall and Winter Interim assessments	3b.1. Formative: Teacher created assessments. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
Reading Goal #3b: <i>The results of the 2012 FAA Reading Test indicates that 80% (14) of students made Learning Gains. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase students making</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	80% (14)	85% (15)					
			3b.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Reading Test 20% of the	3b.2. Create a reward points system geared towards the differentiated level of need to honor and	3b.2. Literacy Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	3b.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment through comparative	3b.2. Formative: Teacher created assessments. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<i>Learning Gains by 5 85% (15)</i>		students did not make Learning Gains in reading	maintain expected behaviors		Data chats following the Fall and Winter Interim assessments	Assessment
		3b.3. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Reading Test 20% of the students did not make Learning Gains in reading	3b.3. Implement Interim teacher made assessment designed for students that take the FAA	3b.3. Literacy Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	3b.3. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment through comparative Data chats following the Fall and Winter Interim assessments	3b.3. Formative: Teacher created assessments. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4a.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test the percent of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains 11 percentage point increase as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading test . Due to the 11 percentage point increase the plan is to continue the strategy in an attempt to duplicate the positive outcome and to target the following areas of need Gr 3and 8 Reading Application, Gr 4,5, 8 Literary Analysis, Gr 4 Informational Text/Research Process, and Gr 7 Vocabulary.	4a.1. Provide before and after school tutoring for targeted students in the Reading subject area.	4a.1. Literacy Leadership Team	4a.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment through comparative Data chats following the Fall and Winter Interim assessments	4a.1. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
Reading Goal #4: <i>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicates that 67% (72) of students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 72% (77).</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 67% (72)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 72% (77)	4a.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test the percent of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains 11 percentage point increase as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading test . Due to the 11 percentage point increase the plan is to continue the strategy in an attempt to duplicate the positive outcome and to target the following areas of need Gr 3and 8 Reading Application, Gr 4,5, 8 Literary Analysis, Gr 4 Informational Text/Research Process, and Gr 7 Vocabulary.	4a.2. Plan supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of FAIR data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice in the elementary grades.	4a.2. Literacy Leadership Team	4a.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment through comparative Data chats following the Fall and Winter Interim assessments	4a.2. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
			4a.3 As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test the percent of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains 11 percentage point increase as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading test . Due to the 11 percentage point increase the plan is to continue the strategy in an attempt to duplicate the positive	4a.3. Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence based, and provided in addition to core.	4a.3. Literacy Leadership Team	4a.3. Student progress is assessed using FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.	4a.3. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		outcome and to target the following areas of need Gr 3and 8 Reading Application, Gr 4,5, 8 Literary Analysis, Gr 4 Informational Text/Research Process, and Gr 7 Vocabulary.				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

DRAFT

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017				
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Baseline data 2010-2011												
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> <i>Our goal is to increase the proportion of students scoring at Levels 3 or above and to reduce the number of students scoring at Levels 1 and 2.</i>												
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool					
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B: <i>As reflected on the 2012 Annual Measurable Objectives 2 (AMO 2) Report X%(0) of Hispanic students in grades 3 through 8 achieved Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test. Given instruction based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards X%(0), a X percent increase, of Hispanic students are expected to achieve Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.</i>			5B.1. Hispanic: As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test our Hispanic subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5B.1. Hispanic: As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test our Hispanic subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5B.1. Literacy Leadership Team	5B.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	5B.1. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td> <td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. Hispanic:</td> <td>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. Hispanic:</td> </tr> </table>			2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. Hispanic:	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. Hispanic:	5B.2. Hispanic: As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test our Hispanic subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5B.2. Hispanic: As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test our Hispanic subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5B.2. Literacy Leadership Team	5B.2. Lesson plan reviews during classroom walkthroughs and teacher observations.	5B.2. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment	
2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*											
Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. Hispanic:	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. Hispanic:											
			5B.3. Hispanic: As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test our Hispanic subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5B.3. Hispanic: As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test our Hispanic subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5B.3. Literacy Leadership Team	5B.3. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	5B.3. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test our ELL subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5C.1.	5C.1. Literacy Leadership Team	5C.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	5C.1. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
Reading Goal #5C: <i>As reflected on the 2012 Annual Measurable Objectives 2 (AMO 2) Report X%(0) of English Language Learner students in grades 3 through 8 achieved Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test. Given instruction based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards X%(0), a X percent increase, of English Language Learner students are expected to achieve Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5C.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test our ELL subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5C.2.	5C.2. Literacy Leadership Team	5C.2. Lesson plan reviews during classroom walkthroughs and teacher observations.	5C.2. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
			5C.3. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test our ELL subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5C.3.	5C.3. Literacy Leadership Team	5C.3. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	5C.3. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test our SWD subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5D.1.	5D.1. Literacy Leadership Team	5D.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	5D.1. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
Reading Goal #5D: <i>As reflected on the 2012 Annual Measurable Objectives 2 (AMO 2) Report X%(0) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) students in grades 3 through 8 achieved Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5D.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test our SWD subgroup	5D.2.	5D.2. Literacy Leadership Team	5D.2. Lesson plan reviews during classroom walkthroughs and teacher observations.	5D.2. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><i>Given instruction based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards X%(0), a X percent increase, of Students with Disabilities students are expected to achieve Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.</i></p>		<p>XXX make AMO2.</p>				<p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment</p>
		<p>5D.3. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test our SWD subgroup XXX make AMO2.</p>	<p>5D.3.</p>	<p>5D.3. Literacy Leadership Team</p>	<p>5D.3. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data</p>	<p>5D.3. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment</p>

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test our ED subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5E.1.	5E.1. Literacy Leadership Team	5E.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	5E.1. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
Reading Goal #5E: <i>As reflected on the 2012 Annual Measurable Objectives 2 (AMO 2) Report X%(0) of Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students in grades 3 through 8 achieved Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test. Given instruction based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards X%(0), a X percent increase, of Economically Disadvantaged students are expected to achieve Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	5E.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test our ED subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5E.2	5E.2. Literacy Leadership Team	5E.2. Lesson plan reviews during classroom walkthroughs and teacher observations.	5E.2. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
			5E.3 As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test our ED subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5E.3	5E.3 Literacy Leadership Team	5E.3 Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	5E.3 Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
IB Training	K-8/All	IB World Schools	School-wide	October 2012	CPL Course Requirements	IB PYP and IB MYP Coordinators
Edusoft Training	K-8/All	Jeanbaptiste	School-wide	September 2012	CPL Course Requirements	PD Liaison
Common Core Training	K-8/All	Klahr	Grade Level/School-wide	Ongoing 2012-13	CPL Course Requirements	Reading Coach

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Afterschool Tutoring	Hourly Teachers	Title I	\$8000

Subtotal: \$8000

Technology

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
SuccessMaker Enterprise	Web-based Software	District Funded	\$9.14 (255) per student

Subtotal: \$2331

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
IB Instructional Support .	Registration and substitute coverage	School Budget	18,388

Subtotal: 18,388

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal: \$28,719

Total: \$28,719

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.		1.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Listening/Speaking Test our 60% (141) students did not meet proficiency. Based on CELLA data the majority of our ELL students need opportunities to engage in academic language Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP)	1.1. Immediate intervention through support (push-in, pull-out) will be provided for students not scoring proficient	1.1. Literacy Leadership Team, ESOL Coordinator	1.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	1.1. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)
CELLA Goal #1: <i>As reflected on the 2012 Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Report 40% (95) of English Language Learner students in grades K through 8 achieved proficiency on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Listening/Speaking Test. Given instruction based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards there will be a decreased in the percent, of English Language Learner students are expected to do not achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the CELLA Listening/Speaking Test.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	40% (95)					
		1.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Listening/Speaking Test our 60% (141) students did not meet proficiency. Based on CELLA data the majority of our ELL students need opportunities to engage in academic language Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP)	1.2. Instruction and targeted intervention is planned in correlation with methods of teaching English Language Learners	1.2. Literacy Leadership Team, ESOL Coordinator	1.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	1.2. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		1.3. As noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Listening/Speaking Test our 60% (141) students did not meet proficiency. Based on CELLA data the majority of our ELL students need opportunities to engage in academic language Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP)	1.3. School-wide test taking strategies are embedded in daily instruction	1.3. Literacy Leadership Team, ESOL Coordinator	1.3. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	1.3. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2. Students scoring proficient in Reading.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #2: <i>As reflected on the 2012 Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Report 26% (60) of English Language Learner students in grades K through 8 achieved proficiency on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Reading Test. Given instruction based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards there will be a decreased in the percent of English Language Learner students are expected to do not achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the CELLA Reading Test.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :	As noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Listening/Speaking Test our 74% (172) students did not meet proficiency. Based on CELLA data the majority of our ELL need instructional focus on Vocabulary, Reading Application, Literary Analysis, and Informational Text/Research skills	Reading benchmarks are used in non-tested subject areas to strengthen reading instruction.	Literacy Leadership Team, ESOL Coordinator	Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)
	26% (60)	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		As noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Listening/Speaking Test our 74% (172) students did not meet proficiency. Based on CELLA data the majority of our ELL need instructional focus on Vocabulary, Reading Application, Literary Analysis, and Informational Text/Research skills	Vocabulary instruction is reinforced and content specific vocabulary is introduced.	Literacy Leadership Team, ESOL Coordinator	Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
		As noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Listening/Speaking Test our 74% (172) students did not meet proficiency. Based on CELLA data the majority of our ELL need instructional focus on Vocabulary, Reading Application, Literary Analysis, and Informational Text/Research skills	Pacing Guides and Focus Calendars are used to regulate instruction.	Literacy Leadership Team, ESOL Coordinator	Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in Writing.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #3: <i>As reflected on the 2012 Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Report 26% (60) of English Language Learner students in grades K through 8 achieved</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :	As noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Writing Test our 74% (176) students did not meet proficiency. Our students need more opportunities to express themselves through writing narrative and persuasive samples	Students will utilize organizational plans and drafting techniques to assist in acquiring writing knowledge	Literacy Leadership Team, ESOL Coordinator	Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)
	26% (62)					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>proficiency on the 2012 Given instruction based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards there will be a decreased in the percent, of English Language Learner students are expected to do not achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the CELLA Writing Test.</p>		<p>2.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Writing Test our 74% (176) students did not meet proficiency. Our students need more opportunities to express themselves through writing narrative and persuasive samples</p>	<p>2.2. Vocabulary instruction is reinforced and content specific vocabulary is introduced in order to expand the student's cadre of words</p>	<p>2.2. Literacy Leadership Team, ESOL Coordinator</p>	<p>2.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data</p>	<p>2.2. Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)</p>
		<p>2.3 As noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Writing Test our 74% (176) students did not meet proficiency. Our students need more opportunities to express themselves through writing narrative and persuasive samples</p>	<p>2.3 Students will participate in writing daily to increase writing fluency.</p>	<p>2.3. Literacy Leadership Team, ESOL Coordinator</p>	<p>2.3 Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data</p>	<p>2.3 Formative: Various quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment, FAIR Summative: 2013 Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)</p>

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Listed under Reading and Math Budgets			

Subtotal:

Technology

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:

Total:

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1a.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test all grade level content cluster scores remained stagnant and/or dropped. This occurred in the area of Gr 3-5 Operations and Statistics, Fractions, and Geometry & Measurement	1a.1. Implement grade level data chats in order to guide mathematics instruction including instruction in the Four Operations to Analyze Data in the Elementary Grades; and Opportunities for Real-World data research, functions and relations, and linear systems in the middle grades	1a.1. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team and Grade level Chairs	1a.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data
Mathematics Goal #1a: <i>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicates that 29% (156) of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 35% (191).</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	29% (156)	35% (191)				
			1a.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test all grade level content cluster scores remained stagnant and/or dropped. This occurred in the area of Gr 3-5 Operations and Statistics, Fractions, and Geometry & Measurement	1a.2. Infuse Successmaker internet based differentiated instructional tools to provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of related addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division facts in grades 3 through 5. Use manipulatives in order to examine perimeter and area in two-and three-dimensional figures and utilize Gizmos to examine statistics and probability.	1a.2. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team and Grade level Chairs	1a.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data
			1a.3. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test all grade level content cluster scores remained stagnant and/or dropped. This occurred in the area of Gr 3-5 Operations and Statistics, Fractions, and Geometry & Measurement	1a.3. Develop an instructional focus calendar for Mathematics instruction providing repeated opportunities for benchmarks in the area of Algebraic Thinking and Data Analysis in grades 3, 4, & 5 and Measurement, Geometry, and Data Analysis in grades 6, 7, & 8	1a.3. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team and Grade level Chairs	1a.3. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1b.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics Test 36%(8) of the students did not meet the target standards in Math and 18%(4) met standards and would benefit from maintenance of these Math skills	1b.1. Shaping Behavior Approach will be used to support successful approximation teaching. Through reinforcement of positive behavioral results with the PMH group	1b.1. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team and SPED Department Chair	1b.1. SPED department data Chats	1b.1. Formative: Teacher created quarterly assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
Mathematics Goal #1b: <i>The results of the 2012 FAA Mathematics Test indicates that 18%(4) of students achieved Level 4, 5, and 6 proficiency. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase Level 4, 5, and 6 student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 23% (5)</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1b.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics Test 36%(8) of the students did not meet the target standards in Math and 18%(4) met standards and would benefit from maintenance of these Math skills	1b.2. Implement the Unique Learning System curriculum through thematic units to support reading instruction at the students individual reading levels for the TMH group.	1b.2. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team and SPED Department Chair	1b.2. Unique Learning Systems quarterly Unit Assessments through SPED department data Chats	1b.2. Formative: Unique Learning Systems quarterly Unit Assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
			1b.3. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics Test 36%(8) of the students did not meet the target standards in Math and 18%(4) met standards and would benefit from maintenance of these Math skills	1b.3. Implement the Mangomon curriculum for vocational and occupational learning	1b.3. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team and SPED Department Chair	1b.3. Mangomon Evaluations	1b.3. Formative: Teacher created assessments. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2a.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test the percentage of students that achieved Level 4 or 5 decrease from 25% in 2011 to 18% in 2012 all grade level content cluster scores remained stagnant and/or dropped. This occurred in the area of Gr 3-5 Operations and Statistics, Fractions, and Geometry & Measurement	2a.1. Infuse Successmaker internet based differentiated instructional tools to provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of related addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division facts in grades 3 through 5. Use manipulatives in order to examine perimeter and area in two-and three-dimensional figures and utilize Gizmos to examine statistics and probability.	2a.1. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team, IB PYP Coordinator, and Grade level Chairs	2a.1. SuccessMaker Data review and evaluation.	2a.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
Mathematics Goal #2a: <i>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicates that 18% (100) of students achieved Level 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to maintain and/or increase level 4 and 5 student proficiency by 3</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	18% (100)	21% (114)					

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

percentage point to 21% (114).				2a.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test the percentage of students that achieved Level 4 or 5 decrease from 25% in 2011 to 18% in 2012 all grade level content cluster scores remained stagnant and/or dropped. This occurred in the area of Gr 3-5 Operations and Statistics, Fractions, and Geometry & Measurement	2a.2. Implement the six transdisciplinary themes of the IB PYP Programme that includes reading across the curriculum.	2a.2. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team, IB PYP Coordinator, and Grade level Chairs	2a.2. Grade level instructional Unit Plans Assessment tool.	2a.2. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.				2b.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics Test 45% of the students did not make Learning Gains in reading	2b.1. Use teacher created cue and correction procedures, reinforces and reinforcement schedules, natural cue and correction conditions, and natural reinforcement conditions for the PMH program.	2b.1. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team and SPED Department Chair	2b.1. SPED department data Chats	2b.1. Formative: Teacher created quarterly assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
Mathematics Goal #2b: The results of the 2012 FAA Mathematics Test indicates that 45% (10) of students achieved at or above Level 7 proficiency. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase at or above Level 7 student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 48% (11)	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
	45% (10)	48% (11)						
				2b.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics Test 45% of the students did not make Learning Gains in reading	2b.2. Provide tools for students at their cognitive ability to extend learning opportunities	2b.2. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team and SPED Department Chair	2b.2. Unique Learning Systems quarterly Unit Assessments through SPED department data Chats	2b.2. Formative: Unique Learning Systems quarterly Unit Assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
				2b.3 As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics Test 45% of the students did not make Learning Gains in reading	2b.3 Use of ecological inventory to strategies to develop functional skill sequences in career and occupational development for the EMH program.	2b.3 MTSS/RTI Leadership Team and SPED Department Chair	2b.3 Mangomon career and occupational development inventory assessments	2b.3 Formative: Teacher created assessments. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.				3a.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test the percent of students making Learning Gains	3a.1. Use literature in mathematics to provide the necessary meaning for children to successfully grasp measurement concepts and allows students to make connections with	3a.1. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team and Grade level Chairs	3a.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	3a.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0
Mathematics Goal #3a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test 66% (281) of students achieved made Learning Gains. Our goal for the 2013 school year is provide appropriate interventions, remediation and enrichment opportunities in order to increase the percentage of students making Learning Gains by 5 percentage point to 71% (302).	66% (281)	71% (302)	66% (281) as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading test 70% (302). The 4 percentage point decrease indicates a need to adjust strategies to incorporate Reading skills and real-life problem solving.	real-world situations			Assessment
			3a.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test the percent of students making Learning Gains 66% (281) as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading test 70% (302). The 4 percentage point decrease indicates a need to adjust strategies to incorporate Reading skills and real-life problem solving.	3a.2. Provide students with hands-on experiences to facilitate the conceptual learning and understanding of grade-level appropriate geometric concepts, data analysis, and measurement.	3a.2. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team and Grade level Chairs	3a.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	3a.2. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
			3a.3. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test the percent of students making Learning Gains 66% (281) as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading test 70% (302). The 4 percentage point decrease indicates a need to adjust strategies to incorporate Reading skills and real-life problem solving.	3a.3. Use Interim Assessment results to re-teach commonly missed items.	3a.3. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team and Grade level Chairs	3a.3. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	3a.3. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
	3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.						
Mathematics Goal #3b:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*		3b.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics Test 14% of the students did not make Learning Gains in math	3b.1. Respond to student needs as noted in assessment reports with additional instruction during Special Area courses	3b.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team, SPED Department Chair	3b.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on Teacher created individual assessments	3b.1. Formative: Teacher created assessments. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
The results of the 2012 FAA Mathematics Test indicates that 86% (15) of students made Learning	86% (15)	91% (16)					
			3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Gains. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase students making Learning Gains by 5 percentage points to 91% (16)			As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics Test 14% of the students did not make Learning Gains in math	Create a reward points system to honor and maintain expected behaviors	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team, SPED Department Chair	Increased progressive student proficiency on Teacher created individual assessments	Formative: Teacher created assessments. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
			3b.3. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics Test 14% of the students did not make Learning Gains in math	3b.3. Implement Interim teacher made assessment designed for students that take the FAA	3b.3. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team, SPED Department Chair	3b.3. Increased progressive student proficiency on Teacher created individual assessments	3b.3. Formative: Teacher created assessments. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
	Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4a.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test the percent of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains 6 percentage point decrease as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test . Gr 3-5 remained stagnant or decreased in the cluster areas of Operations and Statistics, Fractions, and Geometry & Measurement	4a.1. Plan supplemental intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of common assessment data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice, and independent practice.	4a.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team, Grade Level Chair	4a.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	4a.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
Mathematics Goal #4a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test 72% (80) of students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2013 school year is provide appropriate interventions, remediation and enrichment opportunities in order to maintain or increase the percentage of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains by 5 percentage point to 77% (85).	72% (80)	77% (85)					
			4a.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test the percent of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains 6 percentage point decrease as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test . Gr 3-5 remained stagnant or decreased in the cluster areas of Operations and Statistics, Fractions, and Geometry & Measurement	4a.2. Identify and monitor struggling students through common benchmark assessments within the first two weeks of the school year and consistently redirect instruction to meet students’ needs.	4a.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team, Grade Level Chair	4a.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	4a.2. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
			4a.3 As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test the percent of students	4a.3. Build intensive supplemental instruction into the master schedule and provide before and after school tutoring within the	4a.3. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team, Grade Level Chair	4a.3. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	4a.3. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		in the Lowest 25% making learning gains 6 percentage point decrease as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test . Gr 3-5 remained stagnant or decreased in the cluster areas of Operations and Statistics, Fractions, and Geometry & Measurement	first thirty days of school for targeted students in the mathematics subject area.			Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 <u>62</u>	65	68	72	75	78	81
Mathematics Goal #5A: <i>Our goal is to increase the proportion of students scoring at Levels 3 or above and to reduce the number of students scoring at Levels 1 and 2.</i>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		5B.1. Hispanic: As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our Hispanic subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5B.1.	5B.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5B.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	5B.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment	
Mathematics Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
As reflected on the 2012 Annual Measurable Objects 2 (AMO 2) Report X%(0) of Hispanic	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>students in grades 3 through 8 achieved Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test. Given instruction based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards X%(0), a X percent increase, of Hispanic students are expected to achieve Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.</p>	<p>this box. Hispanic:</p>	<p>Hispanic:</p>					
			<p>5B.2. Hispanic: As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our Hispanic subgroup XXX make AMO2.</p>	<p>5B.2.</p>	<p>5B.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team</p>	<p>5B.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data</p>	<p>5B.2. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment</p>
			<p>5B.3. Hispanic: As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our Hispanic subgroup XXX make AMO2.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team</p>	<p>5B.3. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data</p>	<p>5B.3. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment</p>
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:</p>			<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>
<p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>			<p>5C.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our ELL subgroup XXX make AMO2.</p>	<p>5C.1.</p>	<p>5C.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team</p>	<p>5C.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data</p>	<p>5C.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment</p>
<p><u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#5C:</u></p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p>					
<p>As reflected on the 2012 Annual Measurable Objects 2 (AMO 2) Report X%(0) of ELL students in grades 3 through 8 achieved Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test. Given instruction based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards X%(0), a X percent increase, of ELL students are expected to achieve Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</p>	<p>5C.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our ELL subgroup XXX make AMO2.</p>	<p>5C.2.</p>	<p>5C.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team</p>	<p>5C.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data</p>	<p>5C.2. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment</p>
			<p>5C.3.</p>	<p>5C.3.</p>	<p>5C.3.</p>	<p>5C.3.</p>	<p>5C.3.</p>

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our ELL subgroup XXX make AMO2.		MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		5D.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our SWD subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5D.1.	5D.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5D.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	5D.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#5D:</u> <i>As reflected on the 2012 Annual Measurable Objects 2 (AMO 2) Report X%(0) of SWD students in grades 3 through 8 achieved Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test. Given instruction based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards X%(0), a X percent increase, of SWD students are expected to achieve Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
		5D.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our SWD subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5D.2.	5D.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5D.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	5D.2. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
		5D.3. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our SWD subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5D.3.	5D.3. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5D.3. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	5D.3. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		5E.1. As noted on the 2012	5E.1.	5E.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5E.1. Increased progressive student	5E.1. Formative: Quantitative data

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Mathematics Goal #5E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our ED subgroup XXX make AMO2.			proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
As reflected on the 2012 Annual Measurable Objects 2 (AMO 2) Report X%(0) of Economically Disadvantaged(ED) students in grades 3 through 8 achieved Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test. Given instruction based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards X%(0), a X percent increase, of ED students are expected to achieve Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.			5E.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our ED subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5E.2	5E.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5E.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	5E.2. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
			5E.3 As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our ED subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5E.3	5E.3 MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5E.3 Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	5E.3 Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1a.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test all grade level content cluster scores remained stagnant and/or dropped. This occurred in the area of Gr 6-8 Geometry & Measurement, Gr 7 Base Ten, Gr 8 Operations, Problems, & Statistics, and Expressions, Equations, & Functions.	1a.1. Provide opportunities for students to explain and justify procedures to clarify knowledge	1a.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1a.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	1a.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
<u>Mathematics Goal #1a:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicates that 29% (156) of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 35% (191).</i>	29% (156)	35% (191)					
			1a.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test all grade level content cluster scores remained stagnant and/or dropped. This occurred in the area of Gr 6-8 Geometry & Measurement, Gr 7 Base Ten, Gr 8 Operations, Problems, & Statistics, and Expressions, Equations, & Functions.	1a.2. Develop thematic and interdisciplinary projects to help students understand and make real-world connections	1a.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1a.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	1a.2. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
			1a.3. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test all grade level content cluster scores remained stagnant and/or dropped. This occurred in the area of	1a.3. Provide opportunities for students to determine and describe how changes in equations impact results	1a.3. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1a.3. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	1a.3. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		Gr 6-8 Geometry & Measurement, Gr 7 Base Ten, Gr 8 Operations, Problems, & Statistics, and Expressions, Equations, & Functions.					
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1b.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics Test 36%(8) of the students did not meet the target standards in Math and 18%(4) met standards and would benefit from maintenance of these Math skills	1b.1. Shaping Behavior Approach will be used to support successful approximation teaching. Through reinforcement of positive behavioral results with the PMH group	1b.1. Literacy Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	1b.1. SPED department data Chats	1b.1. Formative: Teacher created quarterly assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
Mathematics Goal #1b: <i>The results of the 2012 FAA Mathematics Test indicates that 18%(4) of students achieved Level 4, 5, and 6 proficiency. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase Level 4, 5, and 6 student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 23% (5)</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	18% (4)	23% (5)					
			1b.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics Test 36%(8) of the students did not meet the target standards in Math and 18%(4) met standards and would benefit from maintenance of these Math skills	1b.2. Implement the Unique Learning System curriculum through thematic units to support reading instruction at the students individual reading levels for the TMH group.	1b.2. Literacy Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	1b.2. Unique Learning Systems quarterly Unit Assessments through SPED department data Chats	1b.2. Formative: Unique Learning Systems quarterly Unit Assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
			1b.3. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics Test 36%(8) of the students did not meet the target standards in Math and 18%(4) met standards and would benefit from maintenance of these Math skills	1b.3. Implement the Mangomon curriculum for vocational and occupational learning	1b.3. Literacy Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	1b.3. Mangomon Evaluations	1b.3. Formative: Teacher created assessments. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2a.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test many grade level Reporting Category scores	2a.1. Use virtual manipulatives to explore the mathematics content (FCAT 2.0 Explorer, Gizmos, etc...)	2a.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	2a.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	2a.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0
Mathematics Goal #2a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<i>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicates that 18% (100) of students achieved Level 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to maintain and/or increase level 4 and 5 student proficiency by 3 percentage point to 21% (114).</i>	18% (100)	21% (114)	remained stagnant and/or dropped. This occurred in the area of Gr 6-8 Geometry & Measurement, Gr 7 Base Ten, Gr 8 Operations, Problems, & Statistics, and Expressions, Equations, & Functions.				Assessment
			2a.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test many grade level Reporting Category scores remained stagnant and/or dropped. This occurred in the area of Gr 6-8 Geometry & Measurement, Gr 7 Base Ten, Gr 8 Operations, Problems, & Statistics, and Expressions, Equations, & Functions.	2a.2. Provide opportunities for students to use hands-on activities to explore mathematics content	2a.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	2a.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	2a.2. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
			2a.3 As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test many grade level Reporting Category scores remained stagnant and/or dropped. This occurred in the area of Gr 6-8 Geometry & Measurement, Gr 7 Base Ten, Gr 8 Operations, Problems, & Statistics, and Expressions, Equations, & Functions.	2a.3 Infuse literacy in the mathematics classroom to enhance learning	2a.3 MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	2a.3 Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	2a.3 Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
			2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.				
<u>Mathematics Goal #2b:</u> <i>The results of the 2012 FAA Mathematics Test indicates that 45% (10) of students achieved at or above Level 7 proficiency.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 45% (10)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 48% (11).	2b.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics Test 45% of the students achieved Level 7 or higher action must be taken to maintain this level of achievement.	2b.1. Use teacher created cue and correction procedures, reinforces and reinforcement schedules, natural cue and correction conditions, and natural reinforcement conditions for the PMH program.	2b.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	2b.1. SPED department data Chats	2b.1. Formative: Teacher created quarterly assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
			2b.2. As noted on the 2012	2b.2. Provide tools for students at their	2b.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team ,	2b.2. Unique Learning Systems quarterly	2b.2. Formative: Unique Learning

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase at or above Level 7 student proficiency by 3percentage points to 48% (11)			administration of the FAA Mathematics Test 45% of the students achieved Level 7 or higher action must be taken to maintain this level of achievement.	cognitive ability to extend learning opportunities	SPED Department Chair	Unit Assessments through SPED department data Chats	Systems quarterly Unit Assessments
			2b.3 As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics Test 45% of the students achieved Level 7 or higher action must be taken to maintain this level of achievement.	2b.3 Use of ecological inventory to strategies to develop functional skill sequences in career and occupational development for the EMH program.	2b.3 MTSS/RtI Leadership Team, SPED Department Chair	2b.3 Mangomon career and occupational development inventory assessments	2b.3 Formative: Teacher created assessments. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.			3a.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test the percent of students making Learning Gains 66% (281) as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading test 70% (302). The 4 percentage point decrease indicates a need to adjust strategies to incorporate Reading skills and real-life problem solving.	3a.1. Use literature in mathematics to provide the necessary meaning for children to successfully grasp measurement concepts and allows students to make connections with real-world situations	3a.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	3a.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	3a.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
Mathematics Goal #3a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test 66% (281) of students achieved made Learning Gains. Our goal for the 2013 school year is provide appropriate interventions, remediation and enrichment opportunities in order to increase the percentage of students making Learning Gains by 5 percentage point to 71% (302).				
	66% (281)	71% (302)					
			3a.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test the percent of students making Learning Gains 66% (281) as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading test 70% (302). The 4 percentage point decrease indicates a need to adjust strategies to incorporate Reading skills and real-life problem solving.	3a.2. Provide opportunities for students to collect real-world data for use in classroom calculations	3a.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	3a.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	3a.2. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.			3b.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA	3b.1. Respond to student needs as noted in assessment reports with	3b.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	3b.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on Teacher created	3b.1. Formative: Teacher created assessments.

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Mathematics Goal #3b: <i>On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test 86% (15) of students achieved made Learning Gains. Our goal for the 2013 school year is provide appropriate interventions, remediation and enrichment opportunities in order to increase the percentage of students making Learning Gains by 5 percentage point to 91% (16).</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Mathematics Test 14% of the students did not make Learning Gains in math	additional instruction during Special Area courses		individual assessments	Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
	86% (15)	91% (16)					
			3b.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics Test 14% of the students did not make Learning Gains in math	3b.2. Create a reward points system to honor and maintain expected behaviors	3b.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	3b.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on Teacher created individual assessments	3b.2. Formative: Teacher created assessments. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
			3b.3. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics Test 14% of the students did not make Learning Gains in math	3b.3. Implement Interim teacher made assessment designed for students that take the FAA	3b.3. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	3b.3. Increased progressive student proficiency on Teacher created individual assessments	3b.3. Formative: Teacher created assessments. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4a.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test the percent of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains decreased 5 percentage points from 78% to 72% as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test.	4a.1. Plan supplemental intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of common assessment data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice, and independent practice.	4a.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	4a.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	4a.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
Mathematics Goal #4a: <i>On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test 72% (80) of students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2013 school year is provide appropriate interventions, remediation and enrichment opportunities in order to maintain or increase the percentage of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains by 5 percentage point to 77% (85).</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	72% (80)	77% (85)					
			4a.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test the percent of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains decreased 5 percentage points from 78% to 72% as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test.	4a.2. Identify and monitor struggling students through common benchmark assessments within the first two weeks of the school year and consistently redirect instruction to meet students' needs.	4a.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	4a.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	4a.2. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		4a.3 As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test the percent of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains decreased 5 percentage points from 78% to 72% as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test.	4a.3. Build intensive supplemental instruction into the master schedule and provide before and after school tutoring within the first thirty days of school for targeted students in the mathematics subject area.	4a.3. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	4a.3. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	4a.3. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 <u>62</u>		65	68	72	75	78	81
	Mathematics Goal #5A: <i>Our goal is to increase the proportion of students scoring at Levels 3 or above and to reduce the number of students scoring at Levels 1 and 2.</i>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		5B.1. Hispanic: As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our Hispanic subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5B.1.	5B.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5B.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	5B.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment		
Mathematics Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
As reflected on the 2012 Annual Measurable Objects 2 (AMO 2) Report X%(0) of Hispanic	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.						

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>students in grades 3 through 8 achieved Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test. Given instruction based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards X%(0), a X percent increase, of Hispanic students are expected to achieve Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.</p>	<p>this box. Hispanic:</p>	<p>Hispanic:</p>					
			<p>5B.2. Hispanic: As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our Hispanic subgroup XXX make AMO2.</p>	<p>5B.2.</p>	<p>5B.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team</p>	<p>5B.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data</p>	<p>5B.2. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment</p>
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:</p>			<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>
<p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> <p><u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5C:</p> <p>As reflected on the 2012 Annual Measurable Objects 2 (AMO 2) Report X%(0) of ELL students in grades 3 through 8 achieved Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test. Given instruction based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards X%(0), a X percent increase, of ELL students are expected to achieve Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> <p>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> <p>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</p>	<p>5C.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our ELL subgroup XXX make AMO2.</p>	<p>5C.1.</p>	<p>5C.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team</p>	<p>5C.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data</p>	<p>5C.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment</p>
			<p>5C.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our ELL subgroup XXX make AMO2.</p>	<p>5C.2.</p>	<p>5C.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team</p>	<p>5C.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data</p>	<p>5C.2. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment</p>
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:</p>			<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Mathematics Goal #5D: <i>As reflected on the 2012 Annual Measurable Objects 2 (AMO 2) Report X%(0) of SWD students in grades 3 through 8 achieved Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test. Given instruction based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards X%(0), a X percent increase, of SWD students are expected to achieve Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance: * Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.	5D.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our SWD subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5D.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5D.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	5D.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment	
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our SWD subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5D.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5D.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	5D.2. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
Mathematics Goal #5E: <i>As reflected on the 2012 Annual Measurable Objects 2 (AMO 2) Report X%(0) of Economically Disadvantaged(ED) students in grades 3 through 8 achieved Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test. Given instruction based on the</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance: * Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.	5E.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our ED subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5E.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5E.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	5E.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment	
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test our ED subgroup XXX make AMO2.	5E.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5E.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	5E.2. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0	

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Next Generation Sunshine State Standards <i>X%(0)</i> , a <i>X</i> percent increase, of ED students are expected to achieve Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.						Assessment
--	--	--	--	--	--	------------

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

DRAFT

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

High School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Mathematics Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Mathematics Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Mathematics Goal #3:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box. N/A	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Algebra I EOC)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Algebra EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.			1.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC Test 45% achieved Level 3 achievement in order to maintain this level we must provide students opportunities to calculate real-world problems and to experience higher order thinking equations to challenge their Algebraic skills.	1.1. Provide students with the opportunity to formulate and use different strategies to solve various linear equations.	1.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	1.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC
Algebra Goal #1: <i>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC indicates that 45% (9) of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to maintain level 3 student proficiency at 45% (9).</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <div>45% (9)</div>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <div>45% (9)</div>	1.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC Test 45% achieved Level 3 achievement in order to maintain this level we must provide students opportunities to calculate real-world problems and to experience higher order thinking equations to challenge their Algebraic skills.	1.2. Provide students with the opportunity to write, interpret, and use mathematical expressions and equations	1.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	1.2. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC
			1.3. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC Test 45% achieved Level 3 achievement in order to maintain this level we must provide students	1.3. Allow students to use inductive reasoning strategies that include discovery learning activities	1.3. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1.3. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	1.3. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		opportunities to calculate real-world problems and to experience higher order thinking equations to challenge their Algebraic skills.				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.		2.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC Test 55% achieved Level 4 or 5 achievement in order to maintain this level we must provide students opportunities to calculate real-world problems and to experience higher order thinking equations to challenge their Algebraic skills.	2.1. Use web based online programs to explore and practice Algebraic concepts.	2.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	2.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	2.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC
Algebra Goal #2: <i>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC indicates that 55% (11) of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to maintain level 3 student proficiency at 55% (11).</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	55% (11)	55% (11)				
			2.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC Test 55% achieved Level 4 or 5 achievement in order to maintain this level we must provide students opportunities to calculate real-world problems and to experience higher order thinking equations to challenge their Algebraic skills.	2.2. Allow students to utilize their own Interim assessment data to assess academic progress	2.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	2.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data
			2.3 As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC Test 55% achieved Level 4 or 5 achievement in order to maintain this level we must provide students opportunities to calculate real-world problems and to experience higher order	2.3 Infuse literacy in the Algebra classroom including terminology embedded throughout each lesson	2.3 MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	2.3 Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data
						2.3 Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		thinking equations to challenge their Algebraic skills.					
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Algebra Goal #3A: <i>Our goal is to maintain the proportion of students scoring at Levels 3 or above.</i>	Baseline data 2010-2011						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B: <i>As reflected on the 2012 Annual Measurable Objectives 2 (AMO 2) Report 100%(0) of Hispanic students that took the FCAT 2.0 Algebra I EOC achieved Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2012 administration of the test. Given instruction based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards 100% (0) of Hispanic students are expected to maintain Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Algebra I EOC.</i>		2012 Current Level of Performance: * <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> Hispanic:	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> Hispanic:	3B.1. Hispanic: As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC Test 100% of Hispanic students achieved level 3-5 proficiency.	3B.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	3B.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	3B.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.			3C.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC Test 100% of ELL students achieved level 3-5 proficiency.	3C.1.	3C.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	3C.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	3C.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC
<u>Algebra Goal #3C:</u> <i>As reflected on the 2012 Annual Measurable Objectives 2 (AMO 2) Report 100%(0) of Hispanic students that took the FCAT 2.0 Algebra I EOC achieved Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2012 administration of the test. Given instruction based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards 100% (0) of Hispanic students are expected to maintain Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Algebra I EOC.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.			3D.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC Test 100% of SWD students achieved level 3-5 proficiency.	3D.1.	3D.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	3D.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	3D.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC
<u>Algebra Goal #3D:</u> <i>As reflected on the 2012 Annual Measurable Objectives 2 (AMO 2) Report 100%(0) of SWD students that took the FCAT 2.0 Algebra I EOC achieved Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2012 administration of the test. Given instruction based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards 100% (0) of SWD students are expected to maintain Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Algebra I EOC.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.			3E.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC Test 100% of ED students achieved level 3-5 proficiency.	3E.1.	3E.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	3E.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	3E.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC
<u>Algebra Goal #3E:</u> <i>As reflected on the 2012 Annual Measurable Objectivess 2 (AMO 2) Report 100%(0) of ED students that took the FCAT 2.0 Algebra I EOC achieved Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2012 administration of the test. Given instruction based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards 100% (0) of ED students are expected to maintain Level 3-5 proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Algebra I EOC.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Geometry EOC)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Geometry Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Geometry Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017		
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Baseline data 2011-2012									
Geometry Goal #3A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>									
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>			3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> 2012 Current Level of Performance: <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: </td> <td> 2013 Expected Level of Performance: <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: </td> </tr> </table>			2012 Current Level of Performance: <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance: <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
2012 Current Level of Performance: <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance: <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:								
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Geometry Goal #3C: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Geometry Goal #3D: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Geometry Goal #3E: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
IB Training	K-8/All	IB World Schools	School-wide	October 2012	CPL Course Requirements	IB PYP and IB MYP Coordinators
Edusoft Training	K-8/All	Jeanbaptiste	School-wide	September 2012	CPL Course Requirements	PD Liaison

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
3a.1., 4a.1, 5b.1., 5c.1., 5d.1., and 5e.1.	After school Tutoring	Title I	\$8000
			Subtotal: \$8000
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1a.2.	SuccessMaker Enterprise	District Funded	Listed in the Reading Section
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
2a.1. and 2a.2.	IB Funding	School Budget	18, 388
			Subtotal: \$18,388
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal: \$26,388
			Total: \$26,388

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1a.1. As noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test the Reporting Category scores that remained stagnant or decreased in the 5 th grade are Earth & Space Science and Physical Science	1a.1. Ensure instruction that includes teacher demonstrated as well as student centered lab activities	1a.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1a.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	1a.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment
Science Goal #1a: <i>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicates that 27% (48) of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 31% (56).</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	27% (48)	31% (56)					
			1a.2. As noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test the Reporting Category scores that remained stagnant or decreased in the 5 th grade are Earth & Space Science and Physical Science	1a.2. Instruct science context through the use of mathematical computations	1a.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1a.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	1a.2. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment
			1a.3. As noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test the Reporting Category scores that remained stagnant or decreased in the 5 th grade are Earth & Space Science and Physical Science	1a.3. Adhere to depth and rigor of the NGSSS as noted in the district Pacing Guide	1a.3. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1a.3. District issued quarterly Science Assessment for grade 3, 4, and 5.	1a.3. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment
			1a.4. As noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test the Reporting Category scores that remained stagnant or decreased in the 8 th grade is the Nature of Science	1a.4. Ensure instruction in Comprehensive Science 1, 2, and 3 adhere to depth and rigor of the NGSSS as noted in the district Pacing Guide	1a.4. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1a.4. District issued quarterly Science Assessments for grade 6, 7, and 8 reports.	1a.4. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1b.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Science Test 57%(4) of the students did not meet the target standards in Science and 0%(0) met standards this group of students needs enrichment in Science.	1b.1. Shaping Behavior Approach will be used to support successful approximation teaching. Through reinforcement of positive behavioral results with the PMH group	1b.1. Literacy Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	1b.1. SPED department data Chats	1b.1. Formative: Teacher created quarterly assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
Science Goal #1b: <i>The results of the 2012 FAA Science Test indicates that 0%(0) of students achieved Level 4, 5, and 6 proficiency. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase Level 4, 5, and 6 student proficiency by 14 percentage points to 14% (1)</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0% (0)	14% (1)					
			As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Science Test 57%(4) of the students did not meet the target standards in Science and 0%(0) met standards this group of students needs enrichment in Science.	1b.2. Implement the Unique Learning System curriculum through thematic units to support reading instruction at the students individual reading levels for the TMH group.	1b.2. Literacy Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	1b.2. Unique Learning Systems quarterly Unit Assessments through SPED department data Chats	1b.2. Formative: Unique Learning Systems quarterly Unit Assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
			As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Science Test 57%(4) of the students did not meet the target standards in Science and 0%(0) met standards this group of students needs enrichment in Science.	1b.3. Implement the Mangomon curriculum for vocational and occupational learning	1b.3. Literacy Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	1b.3. Mangomon Evaluations	1b.3. Formative: Teacher created assessments. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2a.1. As noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test the Reporting Category scores that Nature of Science	2a.1. Provide opportunities for students to design and develop projects to increase scientific thinking.	2a.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	2a.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	2a.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment
Science Goal #2a: <i>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicates that 10% (17) of students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase level 4 and 5 student proficiency by 1 percentage points to 11% (20).</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	10% (17)	11% (20)					
			2a.2. As noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test the Reporting Category scores that Nature of Science	2a.2. Ensure that instruction includes student centered laboratory activities that align to the scientific method related to all Reporting Category areas and enrichment activities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects.	2a.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	2a.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	2a.2. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment
			2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		As noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test the Reporting Category scores that Nature of Science	Integrate literacy in the Science classroom in order for students to enhance scientific meaning.	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.		2b.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Science Test 43% of the students achieved Level 7 or higher action must be taken to maintain this level of achievement.	2b.1. Use teacher created cue and correction procedures, reinforces and reinforcement schedules, natural cue and correction conditions, and natural reinforcement conditions for the PMH program.	2b.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership, SPED Department Chair	2b.1. SPED department data Chats	2b.1. Formative: Teacher created quarterly assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
Science Goal #2b: <i>The results of the 2012 FAA Science Test indicates that 43% (3) of students achieved at or above Level 7 proficiency. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase at or above Level 7 student proficiency by 1 percentage points to 44% (4)</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 43% (3)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 44% (4)				
		2b.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Science Test 43% of the students achieved Level 7 or higher action must be taken to maintain this level of achievement.	2b.2. Provide tools for students at their cognitive ability to extend learning opportunities	2b.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership , SPED Department Chair	2b.2. Unique Learning Systems quarterly Unit Assessments through SPED department data Chats	2b.2. Formative: Unique Learning Systems quarterly Unit Assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
		2b.3. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Science Test 43% of the students achieved Level 7 or higher action must be taken to maintain this level of achievement.	2b.3 Use of ecological inventory to strategies to develop functional skill sequences in career and occupational development for the EMH program.	2b.3 MTSS/RtI Leadership , SPED Department Chair	2b.3 Mangomon career and occupational development inventory assessments	2b.3 Formative: Teacher created assessments. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

High School Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Science Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

Biology 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Biology I EOC)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Biology 1 Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Biology 1 Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Biology I EOC Goals

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
P-SELL Curriculum	Grade 5	District	Grade 5 Science	September 2012	PD Follow-Up Assignment	Asst. Principal

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
2a.1., 2a.2.,	Science Lab and Project Supplies	District Budget	4000.00
			Subtotal: \$4000
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Science Goals

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

Writing Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1a.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Writing Test nearly every student made adequate progress trend data for the past four years shows progressive increase and maintenance at above X% for the last two years	1a.1. Students in Grade 4 will cross group for writing and will be placed according to their writing abilities based on the Pretest writing results. Students can move to different groups during the school year if necessary based on the monthly writing assessments	1a.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team, Reading Coach	1a.1. Principal and reading coach will meet with the teachers during grade level meetings to discuss the writing groups and will monitor the writing groups by walking through during their writing lessons to ensure the effectiveness of the writing groups.	1a.1. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment
Writing Goal #1a: <i>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test indicates that 72% (129) of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 75% (134)</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	72% (129)	75% (134)					
			1a.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Writing Test nearly every student made adequate progress trend data for the past four years shows progressive increase and maintenance at above X% for the last two years	1a.2. Students will use the writing process daily; all writing will be dated, and recorded in a writing portfolio for monitoring of growth across time.	1a.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team , Reading Coach	1a.2. A school wide consistent method of saving student work will be established. During the class period, students will place their writing portfolio, open to their last entry, on top of their desks for the Reading Coach to walk through to monitor.	1a.2. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment
			1a.3. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Writing Test nearly every student made adequate progress trend data for the past four years shows progressive increase and maintenance at above X% for the last two years	1a.3. Writing Focus Calendars will be created and implemented into the instruction, where the students will be given expository and narrative tests monthly	1a.3. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team , Reading Coach	1a.3. Administer and score monthly student writing assessments to ensure student progress.	1a.3. Formative: Quantitative data reports District Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1b.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Science Test 75%(6) of the students did not meet the target standards in Writing and 25%(2) met high standards this group of students needs enrichment in Writing instruction.	1b.1. Shaping Behavior Approach will be used to support successful approximation teaching. Through reinforcement of positive behavioral results with the PMH group	1b.1. Literacy Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	1b.1. SPED department data Chats	1b.1. Formative: Teacher created quarterly assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
Writing Goal #1b: <i>The results of the 2012 FAA Writing Test indicates that 25% (2) of students achieved at or above Level 4or higher proficiency. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase at or above Level 4 student proficiency by 10 percentage points to 35%(3)</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	25% (2)	35% (3)					
			1b.2. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Science Test 75%(6) of the students did not meet the target standards in Writing and 25%(2) met high standards this group of students needs enrichment in Writing instruction.	1b.2. Implement the Unique Learning System curriculum through thematic units to support reading instruction at the students individual reading levels for the TMH group.	1b.2. Literacy Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	1b.2. Unique Learning Systems quarterly Unit Assessments through SPED department data Chats	1b.2. Formative: Unique Learning Systems quarterly Unit Assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment
			1b.3. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Science Test 75%(6) of the students did not meet the target standards in Writing and 25%(2) met high standards this group of students needs enrichment in Writing instruction.	1b.3. Implement the Mangomon curriculum for vocational and occupational learning	1b.3. Literacy Leadership Team , SPED Department Chair	1b.3. Mangomon Evaluations	1b.3. Formative: Teacher created assessments. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
The revision and editing process through the continuous use of the writing portfolio	Grades K-4/Language Arts, Reading, Writing	Grade 4 Dept Chair	Grades K-4	October 28, 2011	Lesson Plans	Grade Level Chairs

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Training K-4 teachers	Copies and resources	School Budget	100.00
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal: \$100.00
			Total: \$100.00

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2014-2015)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Civics EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1. As noted by 2012 Baseline Civics Assessment students demonstrate a need for knowledge in the area of U.S. Government and history	1.1. Implement classroom activities which help students develop an understanding of content specific vocabulary.	1.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	1.1. Formative: Teacher created assessment quantitative data reports Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Civics EOC
Civics Goal #1: <i>The results of the 2012 Baseline Civics Assessment indicates that 100% (88) of students did not achieve proficiency. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 5% (4)</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 0% (0)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 5% (4)	1.2. As noted by 2012 Baseline Civics Assessment students demonstrate a need for knowledge in the area of U.S. Government and history	1.2. Guided instruction to strengthen students ability to read and interpret graphs, charts, maps, timelines, political cartoons and other graphic representations	1.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	1.2. Formative: Teacher created assessment quantitative data reports Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Civics EOC
			1.3. As noted by 2012 Baseline Civics Assessment students demonstrate a need for knowledge in the area of U.S. Government and history	1.3. Higher order questions tied to values, complexities, and dilemmas involved in social political, and economic issues.	1.3. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1.3. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	1.3. Formative: Teacher created assessment quantitative data reports Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Civics EOC
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.			2.1. As noted by 2012 Baseline Civics Assessment students demonstrate a need for knowledge in the area of U.S. Government and history	2.1. Implement research activities to allow students to interpret primary and secondary resources	2.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	2.1. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	2.1. Formative: Teacher created assessment quantitative data reports Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Civics EOC
Civics Goal #2: <i>The results of the 2012 Baseline Civics Assessment indicates that 100% (88) of students did not achieve proficiency. Our goal for</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 0% (0)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 5% (4)					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

the 2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 5% (4)		2.2. As noted by 2012 Baseline Civics Assessment students demonstrate a need for knowledge in the area of U.S. Government and history	2.2. Allow students to examine opposing points of view on a variety of issues.	2.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	2.2. Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	2.2. Formative: Teacher created assessment quantitative data reports Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Civics EOC
		2.3 As noted by 2012 Baseline Civics Assessment students demonstrate a need for knowledge in the area of U.S. Government and history	2.3 Implement project based learning activities.	2.3 MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	2.3 Increased progressive student proficiency on the District Interim Assessment as evidenced by comparison data	2.3 Formative: Teacher created assessment quantitative data reports Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Civics EOC

Civics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Civics Goals

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2013-2014)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

U.S. History EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
U.S. History Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
U.S. History Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

U.S. History Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

U.S. History Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

DRAFT

Attendance Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. The 2012 Attendance Discipline Plan was fully implemented during the 2012 school year. However, this caused a spike in Middle Grade tardies.	1.1. Implement a progressive attendance discipline plan to include parent conferences with school administration and offer incentives by recognizing perfect attendance students on a quarterly basis.	1.1. Principal, Asst. Principal, Attendance Clerk	1.1. Average Daily Attendance Report reviews	1.1. Formative: Pearson Gradebook Monthly Average Attendance Reports. Summative: 2013 COGNOS Report
Attendance Goal #1: Our goal for this school year is to increase attendance to 96.39% by minimizing absences due to illness and truancy, and to create a climate in or school where parents, students, and faculty feel welcomed and appreciated.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	95.89% (902)	96.39%(907)					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	264	251					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	285	271					
			1.2. The 2012 Attendance Discipline Plan was fully implemented during the 2012 school year. However, this caused a spike in Middle Grade tardies.	1.2. Schedule parent conferences to discuss the schools role in assistance with attendance, providing flexible meeting time hours before and after school.	1.2. Principal, Asst. Principal, Attendance Clerk	1.2. Average Daily Attendance Report	1.2. Formative: Pearson Gradebook Monthly Average Attendance Reports. Summative: 2013 COGNOS Report
			1.3. The 2012 Attendance Discipline Plan was fully implemented during the 2012 school year. However, this	1.3. Implement a Mini-Field Day activity once per marking period.	1.3. Principal, Asst. Principal,	1.3. Average Daily Attendance Report	1.3. Formative: Pearson Gradebook Monthly Average Attendance Reports.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		caused a spike in Middle Grade tardies.				Summative: 2013 COGNOS Report
--	--	---	--	--	--	-------------------------------

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Reward/reinforce positive behavior	Attendance rewards for targeted groups	PTA Budget	300.00
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Attendance Goals

DRAFT

Suspension Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1. In an effort to decrease the number of in-door and outdoor suspension incidents we need to increase opportunities to reward students for good behavior.	1.1. Utilize the student code of conduct by implementing daily Spill-Out Spotlight on good behavior program	1.1. Administration, Leadership Team	1.1. The number of incidents where students are allowed to picnic lunch outside will be monitored to gauge success	1.1. Formative: Spillout Spotlight participation number of tickets distributed. Summative: 2013 COGNOS Report
Suspension Goal #1: Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions outdoor suspensions by 8 incidents and indoor suspension by 2 incidents	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions					
	20	18					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	15	14					
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	79	71					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	55	50					
			1.2. In an effort to decrease the number of in-door and outdoor suspension incidents we need to increase opportunities to reward students for good behavior.	1.2. Implement Mini-Field Day activity scheduled every marking period.	1.2. Administration, Leadership Team	1.2. Number of classrooms/Homerooms allowed to participate in Field Day Activities	1.2. Formative: Spillout Spotlight participation number of tickets distributed. Summative: 2013 COGNOS Report
			1.3. In an effort to decrease the number of in-door and outdoor suspension incidents we need to increase opportunities to reward students for good behavior.	1.3. Implement incentive permission forms for monthly school sponsored dances	1.3. Administration, Leadership Team	1.3. Student attendance at the monthly dance activities.	1.3. Formative: Spillout Spotlight participation number of tickets distributed. Summative: 2013 COGNOS Report

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Reward/reinforcement for positive behavior	Attendance rewards for targeted groups	PTA Budget	300.00

Subtotal:**Technology**

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:**Professional Development**

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:**Other**

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal: \$300.00**Total: \$300.00**

*End of Suspension Goals***Dropout Prevention Goal(s)**

Note: Required for High School- F.S., Sec. 1003.53

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: N/A <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.</i>					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.

Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: <i>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to provide increased Science and Technology education to our Middle Grade students</i>	1.1. Students have limited schedules due to intensives	1.1. Provide Technology as a course within the elective wheel	1.1. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team and IB MYP Coordinator	1.1. Document the increased number of students enrolled in Technology this school year	1.1. Enrollment Reports 2012-2013
	1.2. Students have limited schedules due to intensives	1.2. Provide IB MYP Students with a Technology Log to document additional hours of instruction in the Technology Design Cycle.	1.2. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team and IB MYP Coordinator	1.2. Document the increased number of students enrolled in Technology this school year	1.2. Enrollment Reports 2012-2013
	1.3. Students have limited schedules due to intensives	1.3. Provide students in the Technology courses with instruction using the FLDOE STEM technology and engineering curriculum	1.3. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team and IB MYP Coordinator	1.3. Document the increased number of students enrolled in Technology this school year	1.3. Enrollment Reports 2012-2013

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: <i>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to provide increased Career and Technical education to our Middle Grade students</i>	1.1.	1.1. Administer the a Career Survey to the 8 th grade students before articulation	1.1. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team, Middle Grade Counselor	1.1. Student use of the survey results to apply for Magnet programs and enroll in high school electives	1.1. Middle Grade Counselor maintenance of successful applicant data, and articulation records
	1.2.	1.2. Participation in high school articulation	1.2. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team, Middle Grade Counselor	1.2. Student use of the survey results to apply for Magnet programs and enroll in high school electives	1.2. Middle Grade Counselor maintenance of successful applicant data, and articulation records
	1.3.	1.3. Encourage students to apply for Magnet and Schools of Choice at the high school level	1.3. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team, Middle Grade Counselor	1.3. Student use of the survey results to apply for Magnet programs and enroll in high school electives	1.3. Middle Grade Counselor maintenance of successful applicant data, and articulation records

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:

Technology

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Additional Goal(s) Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.

Reading Budget	Total: \$28,719
CELLA Budget	Total: See Reading
Mathematics Budget	Total: See Reading
Science Budget	Total: \$4000
Writing Budget	Total: \$100
Civics Budget	Total:
U.S. History Budget	Total:
Attendance Budget	Total: \$300
Suspension Budget	Total: See Attendance
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	Total:
STEM Budget	Total: See Science
CTE Budget	Total:
Additional Goals	Total:

DRAFT

Differentiated Accountability**School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance**

Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2. When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under "Default value" header; 3. Select *OK*, this will place an "x" in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent

Are you reward school? ☐ Yes ☒ No

(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

- Upload a copy of the Differentiated Accountability Checklist in the designated upload link on the *Upload* page

School Advisory Council (SAC)*SAC Membership Compliance*

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community members who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting *Yes* or *No* below.

☒ Yes ☐ No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

The Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) plays a vital role in the decision-making process at Fienberg Fisher K-8 Center as related to specific areas such as School Budget, the School Improvement Plan and the Florida Schools Recognition Award Program. EESAC receives \$5.00 per students enrolled in the school annually. It is an EESAC decision what can be done with these funds. After voting to allocate those funds for this year, a consensus was reached to utilize the funds to purchase hourly personnel for after school and in school tutorials in accordance with the strategies delineated in the SIP. The EESAC is involved in the preparation and evaluation of the school improvement plan. EESAC is the sole body responsible for the final decision-making at the school related to the implementation of the school improvement plan. The School Advisory Council meets monthly to review, evaluate and discuss the school budget to ensure the proper spending of the fiscal school year budget towards student tutorial programs, teacher training, instructional materials, technology and additional support staff. Separate committees are formed to assist the school advisory council in the preparation of the School Improvement Plan. Such committees include Reading, Writing, Mathematics, Science, Parental Involvement and Discipline and Safety. Each committee meets on an individual basis to evaluate the needs of the school and to develop the proper strategies and objectives necessary in order to facilitate growth in overall student academic achievement. Monthly reports are presented to the EESAC at the regularly scheduled meeting by each committee for review and discussion. Other areas that are covered by the EESAC include such topics

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

as safety, parent concerns, student concerns and discipline. The Educational Excellence School Advisory Council offers Fienberg Fisher K-8 Center their full support towards providing a high quality education for all of our learners.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Distributed for tutoring support	\$4000